DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 319 CG 016 913

AUTHOR Cordova, Jacobo; Jacobs, Keith W.
TITLE A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Psychological Differences between College Students and Drug Addicts in New Orleans and San Juan.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Southwestern Psychological Association (29th, San Antonio, TX, April 21-23, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Cultural Differences; Drug Abuse; *Drug Addiction; Higher Education; *Personality Traits

ABSTRACT

Research arguing the validity of the construct of the addictive personality has been criticized for methodology and because it has often been based on a narrow group of personality dimensions. To identify personality differences between drug addicts and college students from two different cultures, four groups of subjects, aged 17-25, were tested. The groups were representative of the following four areas: college students from New Orleans, college students from San Juan, drug addicts from New Orleans, and drug addicts from San Juan. Psychological differences were measured by the Eysenck Personality Inventory and the Adjective Check List. Demographic information was collected by the use of a locally constructed questionnaire. All instruments were administered in either an English or Spanish version. Separate 2X2 analyses of variance were used for each variable studied. Significant differences were identified between populations (drug addicts and college students) on seven variables; significant differences were identified between cities (New Orleans and San Juan) on eight variables. The finding of ten significant interactions between populations and cities makes it difficult to summarize these findings. It is clear, however, that cultural differences (differences between cities) are less common than are population differences or interactions between populations and cities. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED234319

A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Psychological Differences between College Students and Drug Addicts in New Orleans and San Juan

Jacobo Cordova and Keith W. Jacobs
Loyola University in New Orleans

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Keith W. Jacobs
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 016913

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Psychological Association, San Antonio, 1983. Correspondence should be addressed C/O K. W. Jacobs, Department of Psychology, Loyola University, New Orleans, LA 70118.

A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Psychological Differences between College Students and Drug Addicts in New Orleans and San Juan

The purpose of this research is to identify personality differences between drug addicts and college students from two different cultures. Four groups of subjects between the ages of 17 and 25 years old were tested. The groups were representative of the following four areas: college students from New Orleans, college students from San Juan, drug addicts from New Orleans, and drug addicts from San Juan. Psychological differences were measured by the Eysenck Personality Inventory and the Adjective Check List. Demographic information was collected by the use of a locally constructed questionnaire. All instruments were administered in either an English or Spanish version. Separate 2X2 analyses of variance were used for each variable studied. Significant differences were identified between populations (drug addicts and college students) on seven variables; significant differences were identified between cities (New Orleans and San Juan) on eight variables. The finding of ten significant interactions between populations and cities makes it difficult to summarize these findings. It is clear, however, that cultural differences (differences between cities) are less common than are population differences or interactions between populations and cities.

A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Psychological Differences between College Students and Drug Addicts in New Orleans and San Juan

The idea of the "addiction prone personality" has received a substantial amount of attention in the literature. This theory states that persons who become addicted to a drug (or drugs) have specific psychological characteristics or weaknesses that are satisfied by the drug. As noted by Gendreau and Gendreau (1970), support for this theory comes from research that has focused on dimensions of personality related to psychopathology (Ausubel, 1958; Gilbert & Lombardi, 1967; Hill, Haertzen, & Davis, 1962; Sutker, 1971). Gendreau & Gendreau (1970, 1973) however, have criticized many of these studies. Their position has been that the positive findings of personality differences of addicts and nonaddicts in many studies may in fact be artifacts due partially to the investigators failure to appropriately match addict groups with equivalent control groups. Gendreau & Gendreau (1970, 1973) failed to replicate earlier findings in studies in which such matching was employed. Gendreau & Gendreau's point is well taken and should be considered in evaluating research on this subject. Empirical research on the addictive personality can also be criticized on the basis of its extremely narrow focus in terms of the number and kinds of personality dimension studied. The

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), for instance, has been used as the source of personality traits to be studied in the majority of the most frequently cited empirical studies (Gendreau & Gendreau, 1970, 1973; Gilbert & Lombardi, 1967; Hill, 1962; Olson, 1964; Sutker, 1971). At the same time, only a limited number of studies have focused on other traits (Martin & Inglis, 1965). Thus, it would seem that the current research findings that have been used to argue for the validity of the construct of the addictive personality theory have already been criticized on the basis of methodology and are potentially open to additional criticism because they are based on a relatively narrow group pf personality dimensions.

Other available personality measures conceptualize personality along more normal dimensions. The original formulation of the Eysenck Personality Inventory relied on two major dimensions, extraversion and neuroticism. This conceptualization received support from physiological research (Eysenck, 1976; Claridge & Chappa, 1973) and psychometric research (Eysenck, 1969; Wakefield, 1974,). Another instrument which has received considerable attention in the literature is the Adjective Check List (Gough & Heilburn, 1965). This instrument measures at least 34 dimensions of personality and has been extensively used in both cross-cultural research (Calderon-Teran & de Morales, 1970; Gough, Fioraventi, & Lazzari, 1979) and in the area of drug addiction.

The purpose of the present study is to identify psychological differences between college students and drug addicts in New Orleans

and San Juan. For the purposees of this study it was decided to conceptualize psychological differences as a relatively wide range of normal personality traits.

Method

Subjects

Two hundred subjects were tested during 1981 and 1982. One hundred of these were obtained in New Orleans and 100 in San Juan, Puerto Rico. One half of each group was recruited from local universities and one half from residential drug treatment programs. All subjects participated as unpaid volunteers.

The age range for the total sample was from 17 to 25 years old, with a mean age of 19.80 years.

Apparatus

Each subject completed a packet consisting of the following instruments: a locally constructed questionnaire that covered demographic and family information, the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI), and the Adjective Check List (ACL). Each instrument was obtained or created in equivalent English and Spanish forms for use with the respective populations.

The commercially available English and Spanish forms of the EPI were used in this study. However, the available Spanish form of the ACL did not appear to be a suitable translation for use with

this population. It was therefore necessary to develop an equivalent Spanish form, which was accomplished by having twenty college students who were bilingual and fluent in both English and Spanish give the equivalent Spanish word for each English word in the ACL. The most frequently given Spanish-equivalent words was used in a cross-validation study in which another 20 students translated these words back into English. As a result of these manipulations, equivalent English and Spanish versions of the ACL were developed. Additional validation work is now being completed on these scales. The biographical questionnaire was originally developed as equivalent English and Spanish forms.

Procedure

The instruments used in this study were adminstered in small goup settings. Residents in the drug treatment programs were excused from other scheduled activities to complete these instruments in informal settings. College students in this study generally completed the instruments in traditional classroom settings. The same instructions were used for all subjects, in either English or Spanish versions. It should be noted that for approximately 35 to 40% of the residents in drug treatment programs it was necessary to administer the instruments orally, due to an inability of the subjects to read or write in either language. In these cases, approximately an hour and a half was required for administration of the instruments. Otherwise, administration required from 45 to 90 minutes.

Results

Two-way factorial analyses of variance were used as the statistical tests for differences between cities (San Juan and New Orleans) and populations (addicts and college students). As might be expected, there were significant differences between the populations and interactions involving the population variable.

Table 1 provides a description of the subjects in this study, in terms of common demographic variables. Since there were no significant interactions among these variables, this table compares the two populations (addicts versus college students) and the two cities (New Orleans and San Juan). The addicts were significantly older than the college students, and the San Juan population was significantly older than the New Orleans population. The addicts came from significantly larger families than did the college students, and the subjects from San Juan grew up in significantly larger families than did the subjects from New Orleans. Marital status at the time of testing was approximately the same for all groups.

Table 2 presents a summary of the 18 separate two-way analyses of variance that were performed on the personality variables. It is apparent from this table that there were four significant interactions at the .01 probability level, and ten significant interactions if the .05 level were used. The two cities were significantly different from each other on four of these variables (at p .01).

The two populations were significantly different from each other on six variables (again, using the .01 probability level). For 14 of these 18 variables there was either a significant main effect or interaction. The means for these variables are presented in Table 3.

These results lead rather directly to impressions of cross-cultural differences. The New Orleans subjects in this study, based on the ACL, generally appear to conform to society's idea of right and wrong, and see themselves in control over their own lives. They don't seem to need close affiliations with family or friends. The San Juan sample, on the other hand, shows a relatively high need for affiliation with other people, with is particularly the case with the addicts in San Juan. The San Juan subjects feel that they are not in control over what happens and seem to lack direction in their lives.

If one were to use this same data to compare addicts and college students, some interesting generalizations might emerge. The profile of addicts, from the EPI and ACL, present a picture of neurotic individuals with a marked need for affiliation with other people, particularly in the case of addicts in San Juan. The addicts in this study, regardless of culture, appear rather submissive and introverted They are non-aggressive, particularly the addicts in San Juan. And they have a rather poor self concept. However, the New Orleans addicts

appear to be unusually self-confident. In the case of addicts, the culture seems to influence the profile that emerges.

The college students in this study, on the other hand, exhibit little in the way of neurotic feelings and have a rather low need for affiliation. They are dominant, extroverted, and aggressive, and have a high self concept. These generalizations seem to apply equally to college students in both cultures.

Discussion

Hopefully, these findings should help clarify our understanding of cultural differences in personality traits and throw some new light on our preconceived notions about the characteristics of drug addicts. In the case of drug addicts, the interactions observed in this study would suggest that addicts are not a homogeneous group or the same across different cultures. Looking at the personality variables that were measured, it is interesting that a number of these did not show cultural differences. Presumably, these sources of individual differences are free of cultural influences.

There are, of course, a number of limitations of the present study and the tendency to over-generalize should be taken into consideration. The comparisons made in this study involve only two geographic areas and the institutions from which subjects were recruited may not be adequately representative. Although there were attempts to use comparable universities and comparable drug treatment programs in each city, there were a number of extraneous variables that were not controlled for.

Ausubel, D. P. Drug addiction: Physiological, psychological, and sociological aspects. New York: Random House, 1958.

Calderon-Teran, M. E. & de morales, A. M. Adaptacion del test "Lista de adjetivos a marcar" a una muestra adolecente del gran Sangiago. Unpublished graduate dissertation, Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile. Santiago, 1970

Gendreau, P., & Gendreau, L. P. The addiction prone personality: A study of Canadian heroin addicts. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1970. 2, 19-25.

Gendreau, P., & Gendreau, L. P. A theoritical note on personality characteristics of heroin addicts. Canadian Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 82, 139-140.

Gilbert, J. G., & Lombardi, D. N. Personality characteristics of young male narcotic addicts. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 1967, 31, 536-538.

Gough, H. G., Fioravanti, M., & Lazzari, R. A cross-cultural unisex ideal self scale for the Adjective Check List. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1979, 35, 314-319.

Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. The Adjective Check List manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1965.

Eysenck, H. J. The biological basis of personality. Springfield: Thomas. 1967.

Eysenck, H. J. The structure of human personality. London: Methuen, 1970.

Hill, H. E., Haertzen, C. A., & Davis, H. An MMPI factor analytic study of alcoholics, narcotic addicts and criminals. Quarterly Journal of Studies in Alcohol. 1962, 23, 411-431.

Olson, R. W. MMPI sex differences in narcotic addiction. Journal of General Psychology, 1964, 71, 257-266.

Sutker, P., & Allain, A. L. Incarcerated and street heroin addicts: A personality comparison. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 243-246.

Wakefield, J. A., Jr., Yom, B. L., Bradley, P. E. Doughtie, E. B., Cox, J. A. & Kraft, I. A. Eysenck's personality dimensions: a model for the MMPI. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 13, 413-420.

Table 1

Description of Subjects

Variable	Differences between Populations		Differences between Cities	
	Addict	College	NOLA	SJPR
Number	100	100	100	100
Age	20.20	19.40	19.46	20.14
Family Size	4.34	2.90	2.81	4.43
Single	85	99	92	92
Married	9	1	3	7
Other	6	0	5	1

Table 2

Summary of F Ratios

Variable	Population	Country	Interaction
EPI/Extraversion	1.00	1.13	1.00
EPI/Neuroticism	22.71 **	1.00	4.34 *
EPI/Lie Scale	1.00	26.24 **	4.66
ACL/Order	1.13	6.57 **	2.15
ACL/Affiliation	100.99 **	29.82 *	59.23 **
ACL/Heterosexuality	1.33	1.00	5.56 *
ACL/Change	1.00	4.70 *	4.21 *
ACL/Self Control	1.82	10.96 **	4.63 *
ACL/Self Confidence	2.46	5.09 *	7.10 **
ACL/Achievement	5.74 *	1.77	3.19
ACL/Dominance	7.56 **	2.56	1.00
ACL/Endourance	1.00	3.29	1.00
ACL/Exhibitionism	±6.64 **	1.84	1.77
ACL/Autonomy	1.00	1.00	1.00
ACL/Aggression	±4.23 **	5.38 *	28.80 **
ACL/Personal Adjustment	1.03	1.00	2.17
ACL/Ideal Self	8.26 **	1.00	4.09 *
ACL/Adult	1.00	5.13 *	14.27 **

** $p < .01$

* $p < .05$

Table 3

Comparisons of Psychological Scales

	Population		Country		Interaction			
Variable	Addict	College	NOLA	SJPR	ANOLA	ASJPR	CNOLA	CSJPR
EPI/E	12.74	12.71	12.48	12.97	12.32	13.16	12.64	12.87
EPI/N	13.54*	10.59*	12.13	12.00	12.96+	14.12+	11.30+	9.88+
EPI/L	2.65	2.58	2.01*	3.22*	2.30+	3.00+	1.72+	3.44+
ACL/Order	65.94	63.49	67.71*	61.68*	70.68	61.20	64.74	62.19
ACL/Affil.	68.88*	46.90*	52.01*	64.11*	55.66*	82.10*	48.36*	45.38*
ACL/Hetero.	62.80	60.72	61.36	62.19	60.30+	65.30+	62.42+	58.96+
ACL/Change	58.42	58.20	60.34+	55.88+	62.36+	53.68+	58.32+	58.08+
ACL/Self-C.	60.73	58.08	62.66*	66.10*	66.10+	55.36+	59.22+	56.94+
ACL/Selfco.	57.58	54.75	58.20+	54.13+	62.02*	53.14*	54.38*	55.12*
ACL/Achiev.	62.33+	67.28+	66.18	63.43	61.86	62.80	70.50	64.06
ACL/Domin.	55.05*	59.79*	56.04	58.80	53.24	56.86	58.84	60.74
ACL/Endour.	57.79	57.03	59.20	55.62	60.20	55.38	58.20	55.86
ACL/Exhib.	57.57*	66.41*	63.46	60.52	60.48	54.66	66.44	66.38
ACL/Autonomy	61.72	62.22	61.65	62.29	61.34	62.10	61.96	62.48
ACL/Aggres.	56.88*	63.79*	62.46+	58.21+	62.92*	49.84*	61.00*	66.58*
ACL/Pers.A.	53.97	55.97	54.01	55.93	54.46	53.48	53.56	58.38
ACL/Ideal S.	55.78*	61.51*	57.94	59.35	53.06+	58.50+	62.82+	60.20+
ACL/Adult	51.05	52.34	53.00+	49.89+	56.10*	46.20*	51.10*	53.53*

* $p < .01$

+ $p < .05$